

REMARKS

As a preliminary matter, Applicants specifically traverse the outstanding Advisory Action as being wholly nonresponsive. The Examiner's entire answer to all of the arguments presented in Response F, filed October 18, 2006, was the lone cursory statement that "applicants arguments have been fully considered, but they are not persuasive." No single reason was given by the Examiner, however, for why the arguments were not persuasive, or why the Examiner did not address the substance of the arguments. Accordingly, all of the previous arguments from Response F, as well as the previous Responses, are incorporated by reference here.

For several responses now, Applicants' have demonstrated in significant detail how the Examiner has not given any consideration to specific claim language that was added in Amendment B, filed July 2, 2004. Not only was the Examiner required to give all such specific claim terms their distinct patentable weight, Section 707.07(f) of the MPEP placed an additional burden upon the Examiner to respond to the substance of all of the meritorious arguments presented by Applicants traversing the rejection. In the present case, however, the Examiner has not met either of these burdens. A one-sentence denial of the many pages of detailed arguments against the rejection fails to answer such arguments in any substantive way.


Nevertheless, and only in the effort to expedite the stalled prosecution of this case, Applicants have amended independent claims 1 and 8 herein to further describe features of the present invention as previously argued. Accordingly, Applicants submit that the Examiner should find that, not only has the outstanding rejection been overcome

for at least the reasons of record, the present invention is still further patentable over all of the references of record in light of these newly amended features as well.

For all of the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that this Application, including claims 1, 8, 23, 32-41, 57, 59-61, 63, and 65-69, is in condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney if a further interview would expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD.

By 
Josh C. Snider
Registration No. 47,954

Customer No. 24978

December 21, 2006

300 South Wacker Drive
Suite 2500
Chicago, Illinois 60606
Telephone: (312) 360-0080
Facsimile: (312) 360-9315

P:\DOCS\1508\65123\B16805.DOC